



November 7, 2016 | 9:00 – 10:45 am  
10 Park Plaza | Conference Room 4  
(directly behind the security desk on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor)

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Action items:

1. Core staff develop proposals for next set of alternatives (5, 6, 7)
2. MAPC distribute to Working Group slides comparing Planned Growth and No Build and more detailed breakdown showing where increased growth in study area will draw from in region
3. MAPC circulate work-from-home research document
4. MAPC and CTPS to make recommendation whether to use cost or availability to model constraints on commercial parking
5. CTPS to follow up with Boston to get Sullivan Square alternative inputs
6. CTPS to send out its slides on options for alternatives 3, 4.1, 4.2 as well as additional details on bus routes (spreadsheet) (CTPS will do mapping of routes if needed)
7. CTPS to determine more details of recommended TMA routes (whether to use existing MBTA routes or other)
8. CTPS to run no-build with 4.5 minute headways
9. CTPS to provide brief summary comparing these modeling activities to those done for the Everett Transit Action Plan to WG

### Discussion:

#### *Introduction:*

Pat Field (CBI) reviewed the agenda and previewed the topics the group would cover during the discussion. The Working Group approved the October meeting summary.

#### *Land Use Scenario #2: "Planned Growth":*

Tim Reardon (MAPC) presented preliminary results of the demographic projections, including population, households, and employment, for the Planned Growth alternative land use scenario to the Working Group. The analysis showed increased household and employment density in the scenario focus area as compared to the RTP demographic projections.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See the LMRWG Land Use Scenario #2: Planned Growth presentation slides for exact numbers detailing these comparisons.

David Mohler (MassDOT) requested additional information to compare the rates of increase or decrease in the MAPC region for these demographic numbers to the projected increases and decreases in the MAPC region under the RTP scenario. MAPC agreed to provide a more detailed breakdown of the demographic numbers to the Working Group to review for this purpose.

*Public engagement:*

Carri Hulet (CBI) updated the Working Group on public engagement. She provided a preliminary update on results of the electronic survey, which as of the meeting had 140 respondents. The survey was set to be closed on December 2. On October 31, the public engagement subcommittee held a dry run of the public meeting presentation for Working Group members and received valuable feedback on the presentation content. Ms. Hulet also previewed the content of the November 9 public meeting with the Working Group and asked for any additional questions or feedback.

*Review of potential alternative scenarios 3 and 4:*

Scott Peterson (CTPS) presented to the Working Group some refined options for the next round of alternative scenarios to model. He reviewed that the Working Group had agreed to model Alternative 1 - Planned Growth Land Use and Alternative 2 – an alternative option for the planned Sullivan Square and Rutherford Avenue redesign.

He proposed options for alternatives 3 and 4 that included residential and commercial parking restrictions, bus improvements, TMA shuttles, bike/ped infrastructure improvements, and a TDM work-at-home policy in some portions of certain sectors of the workforce.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Peterson clarified that commercial parking restrictions would be modeled based on a reduction rate per TAZ that MAPC would recommend, which CTPS would use to reduce the number of auto trips going to that TAZ and reassign those trips to other modes. Residential parking would be reduced by decreasing the auto ownership rate per area by an amount MAPC recommends.

MAPC and CTPS agreed to follow up to determine whether to use cost or availability as the inputs to simulate parking restrictions in the model. CTPS recommended reviewing the changes in the planned growth scenario before deciding whether to do a Synchro-level analysis of the proposed scenarios 3 and 4. The Working Group decided to wait to review the results of the Sullivan Square alternative before deciding whether to use it or the no-build transportation network as a baseline in subsequent scenarios.

Working Group members expressed some concern about alternatives 3 and 4 being framed as low-cost, light infrastructure alternatives, considering the additional costs that might be implicated in the proposed improvement and expansion of bus routes in those scenarios. Working Group members requested more specificity on the exact bus routes and bus improvements implied in the proposed alternatives in order for Working Group members to evaluate their significance locally and also to get a better sense of the investment that the

---

<sup>2</sup> For more detailed information on the inputs proposed as parts of alternatives 3 and 4, see the November 7, 2016 "LMRWG Alternatives Presentation."

scenario would require if it were implemented. CTPS agreed to provide a spreadsheet detailing the routes and changes included in the proposed scenario and agreed if necessary to map the proposed changes. Mr. Peterson clarified that the bus improvements in proposed alternatives 3 and 4 were not universal in the study area, but rather were targeted for routes that had high ridership, needed increase supply, and/or would meet the needs of increased development in the pipeline.

Chris Kuschel and Sarah Philbrick of MAPC provided additional detail on the proposed TDM work-at-home policy and the recommendations developed through MAPC's research.<sup>3</sup>

Working Group members asked for more detail concerning the details in proposed scenarios 3 and 4, including:

- Would proposed improved bus connectivity to subways exacerbate crowding on the Orange Line?
- What routes would the proposed TMAs follow and would they track existing MBTA routes?
- How does the bus modeling in these scenarios compare to that done for the Everett Transit Action Plan study?
- What is the impact of a flexible/work-at-home policy on changing trips originating in or ending in the scenario focus area? Is work-at-home at the rate recommended already captured in the model?

*Subsequent scenarios to model:*

Mr. Peterson described inputs that could be included in several future scenarios, including transit services, auto/highway improvements, bike/pedestrian infrastructure and services.<sup>4</sup>

Working Group members discussed inputs to combine in possible future scenarios in broad terms, including the possibility of designing transit-focused and highway-focused alternatives.

*Modeling decisions:*

The Working Group affirmed that the modeling staff should go forward with modeling scenarios 1 – Planned Growth, and 2 – Sullivan Square/Rutherford Ave. alternate design.

The Working Group agreed to make decisions on scenarios 3 and 4 after reviewing more detailed information it requested from the core staff.

In addition to finalizing scenarios 3 and 4, the Working Group decided to make decisions on model runs 5, 6, and 7 at the December LMRWG meeting (based on proposals developed by core staff from priorities identified by the Working Group.)

---

<sup>3</sup>For more detail on the flexible work policy proposal, see the "Flexible Work Summary" document.

<sup>4</sup> For detail on other proposed inputs, including mapping, see the "LMRWG Alternatives Presentation" from November 7 2016.

The Working Group decided to review the results of the Planned Growth and Sullivan Square/Rutherford Ave. alternatives at the January Working Group meeting and instruct the core staff then regarding which scenarios to use as the baseline for model runs 3-7.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.